

Case Number:	CM15-0089364		
Date Assigned:	05/13/2015	Date of Injury:	05/05/2008
Decision Date:	06/16/2015	UR Denial Date:	04/15/2015
Priority:	Standard	Application Received:	05/08/2015

HOW THE IMR FINAL DETERMINATION WAS MADE

MAXIMUS Federal Services sent the complete case file to an expert reviewer. He/she has no affiliation with the employer, employee, providers or the claims administrator. He/she has been in active clinical practice for more than five years and is currently working at least 24 hours a week in active practice. The expert reviewer was selected based on his/her clinical experience, education, background, and expertise in the same or similar specialties that evaluate and/or treat the medical condition and disputed items/Service. He/she is familiar with governing laws and regulations, including the strength of evidence hierarchy that applies to Independent Medical Review determinations.

The Expert Reviewer has the following credentials:

State(s) of Licensure: Iowa, Illinois, Hawaii

Certification(s)/Specialty: Preventive Medicine, Occupational Medicine, Public Health & General Preventive Medicine

CLINICAL CASE SUMMARY

The expert reviewer developed the following clinical case summary based on a review of the case file, including all medical records:

The injured worker is a 52 year old male who sustained an industrial injury on 05/05/08. Initial complaints and diagnoses are not available. Treatments to date include medications, home exercise and physical therapy. Diagnostic studies are not addressed. Current complaints include left index finger pain. Current diagnoses include complex regional pain syndrome left upper extremity, and chronic pain. In a progress note dated 03/30/15 the treating provider reports the plan of care as medications including electrodiagnostic and nerve conduction studies of the upper extremities, home exercise program, and medications including Nucynta, Celebrex, Tizanidine, Celecoxib, and Gabapentin. The requested treatments include electrodiagnostic and nerve conduction studies of the upper extremities and Gabapentin.

IMR ISSUES, DECISIONS AND RATIONALES

The Final Determination was based on decisions for the disputed items/services set forth below:

One (1) electromyography/Nerve conduction velocity for the bilateral upper extremities:
Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS ACOEM Chapter 11 Forearm, Wrist, and Hand Complaints Page(s): 260-262. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Pain, Electrodiagnostic testing (EMG/NCS).

Decision rationale: ACOEM States "Appropriate electrodiagnostic studies (EDS) may help differentiate between CTS and other conditions, such as cervical radiculopathy. These may include nerve conduction studies (NCS), or in more difficult cases, electromyography (EMG) may be helpful." ODG states "Recommended needle EMG or NCS, depending on indications. Surface EMG is not recommended. Electromyography (EMG) and Nerve Conduction Studies (NCS) are generally accepted, well-established and widely used for localizing the source of the neurological symptoms and establishing the diagnosis of focal nerve entrapments, such as carpal tunnel syndrome or radiculopathy, which may contribute to or coexist with CRPS II (causalgia), when testing is performed by appropriately trained neurologists or physical medicine and rehabilitation physicians (improperly performed testing by other providers often gives inconclusive results). As CRPS II occurs after partial injury to a nerve, the diagnosis of the initial nerve injury can be made by electrodiagnostic studies." ODG further clarifies "NCS is not recommended, but EMG is recommended as an option (needle, not surface) to obtain unequivocal evidence of radiculopathy, after 1-month conservative therapy, but EMG's are not necessary if radiculopathy is already clinically obvious." In the provided medical documents symptoms are documented on the left side only, it is unclear why bilateral upper extremity testing is requested. As such, the request for One (1) electromyography/Nerve conduction velocity for the bilateral upper extremities is not medically necessary.

Gabapentin 600 mg #90: Upheld

Claims Administrator guideline: The Claims Administrator did not cite any medical evidence for its decision.

MAXIMUS guideline: Decision based on MTUS Chronic Pain Treatment Guidelines Anti-Epilepsy Drugs Page(s): 16-22. Decision based on Non-MTUS Citation Official Disability Guidelines (ODG) Chronic Pain, Anti-epilepsy drugs (AEDs) for pain, Gabapentin (Neurontin).

Decision rationale: The MTUS considers Gabapentin as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain and effective for the treatment of spinal cord injury, lumbar spinal stenosis, and post op pain. MTUS also recommends a trial of Gabapentin for complex regional pain syndrome. ODG states "Recommended Trial Period: One recommendation for an adequate trial with Gabapentin is three to eight weeks for titration, then one to two weeks at maximum tolerated dosage. (Dworkin, 2003) The patient should be asked at each visit as to whether there has been a change in pain or function. Current consensus based treatment algorithms for diabetic neuropathy suggests that if inadequate control of pain is found, a switch to another first-line drug is recommended." Additionally, ODG states that Gabapentin "has been shown to be effective for treatment of diabetic painful neuropathy and postherpetic neuralgia and has been considered as a first-line treatment for neuropathic pain." The patient reports improvement on Lyrica but felt prior treatment with Gabapentin had been more beneficial. Provided medical documentation lacks objective information on the success or failure of the prior trial of Gabapentin. As such, the request for Gabapentin 600 mg #90 is not medically necessary.